

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 19 are respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated March 9, 2005 (Paper No. 03022005) and believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

The Specification and Abstract of the application have been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors, and to reflect changes made in the claims. Applicant submits that no new matter was added to the Specification or the Abstract during this process.

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the allowability of claims 2, 9 and 15-18. Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated features of claims 2 and 16-17 into independent claims 1 and 19, respectively, and believes that these claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite because the Examiner contends that the term "a wire form" in line 2 of claim 2 is not clearly defined in the specification. The cancellation of this claim language renders the rejection moot. However, "wire form" also appears in claim 19. To further overcome this rejection, Applicant has amended the Specification to define

Appl. No. 10/809,181
Amdt. dated June 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

the term “wire form” as “a metallic band” (p. 7, l. 16). In the specification, wire form is also described as a “valve linkage” (p. 3, l. 21). Also, it is submitted that the term is well accepted in the art for the designated structure. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the §112 rejection.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. 2002/0108997, now U.S. Pat. No. 6,705,501). To overcome the rejection, Applicant has incorporated features of claim 2, which has been canceled, into claim 1, which the Examiner has deemed allowable.

In addition, Applicant has amended claim 13 to include features of canceled claim 14 and to recite, among other things, “said adjustment end is provided with a pair of outwardly facing toothed edges diverging from each other, and said cage stop has a skirt with a pair of inwardly facing toothed surfaces configured for engaging both said toothed edges.” Applicant submits that Miller does not include all of the features recited in amended claim 13. Specifically, Applicant contends that Miller does not include the tooth engagement features recited in amended claim 13.

Finally, Applicant has amended claim 19 to incorporate features of claims 16 and 17, which were indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 19.

Appl. No. 10/809,181
Amdt. dated June 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

In view of the above amendments, the application is respectfully submitted to be in allowable form. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, she is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Rebecca L. Uryga
Registration No. 53,713

Customer No. 24978

June 7, 2005
300 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315